DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 104 FL 008 098

AUTHOR Lebach, Susan M.
TITLE A Report on the Culver City Spanish Immersion Program in Its Third Year: Its Implications for Language and Subject Matter Acquisition, Language Use, and Attitudes.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 105p.; M.A. Thesis, University of California, Los Angeles

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; English; Language Arts; Language Attitudes; *Language Development; *Language Programs; Language Skills; Primary Education; *Program Evaluation; Reading Skills; *Second Language Learning; *Spanish; Speech Skills; Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS California (Culver City); *Immersion Programs

ABSTRACT

In the fall of 1971, a Spanish immersion program was initiated in kindergarten at the Linwood Howe Elementary School in Culver City, California. The original (pilot) group was in grade 2 at the time of this study, which focused on the pilot group in grade 2 and the follow-up group at grade 1. The major questions examined were: (1) Are the students suffering a deficit in English oral and reading skills? (2) How are the students progressing in Spanish oral and reading skills? (3) Are the students achieving at grade level in a non-language subject matter, i.e., mathematics? (4) What are the attitudes of the participating students, teachers, and parents toward the Spanish immersion program? The findings indicate that the students are: (1) not suffering a deficit in English oral or reading skills; (2) progressing satisfactorily in Spanish oral and reading skills; (3) achieving at grade level in mathematics; (4) developing positive attitudes toward the Spanish language and culture, and toward foreign language learning in general. Both the immersion teachers and parents strongly supported the program and advocated its continuation. (Author/KM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

A Report on the Culver City Spanish Immersion Program in its Third Year: Its Implications for Language and Subject Matter Acquisition, Language Use, and Attitudes

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Second Language

by

Susan M. Lebach

1974

FL008098

The thesis of Susan M. Lebach is approved.

Evelyn Hatch

Evelyn Hatch

J. Donald Bowen

J. Donald Bowen

Luis M. Laosa

Luis M. Laosa

Andrew D. Cohen

Andrew D. Cohen, Committee Chairman

University of California, Los Angeles

1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
ABSTRACT	vi
CHAPTER	
I. AREA OF INVESTIGATION	1
Historical Background	1
Statement of the Research Problem	6
Purpose of the Study	7
Procedural Statement	8
II. EVALUATION OF ENGLISH, SPANISH, AND MATHEMATICAL PROFICIENCY	9
Introduction	9
Follow-Up Group in Grade 1	11
Pilot Group in Grade 2	24
III. STUDENT, TEACHER, AND PARENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE SPANISH IMMERSION PROGRAM	43
Statement of the Research Problem	43
Past Research Undertaken at the Spanish Immersion Program	44
Purpose of Present Study and Procedures	45
Findings	47
Summary	64
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	69
Summary of Responses to Research Questions	69
Limitations of this Study	72
Conclusions	74
Recommendations	76
REFERENCES	79
APPENDIXES	83

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
I.	Summary of Test Results for Grade 1.	15
II.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance on English Reading (Grade 1)	17
III.	Two-way Analysis of Variance on Spanish Reading (Grade 1)	19
IV.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance on Mathematical Proficiency (Grade 1)	20
V.	Summary of Test Results for Grade 2	29
VI.	Results of Bilingual Syntax Measure, English Version	31
VII.	Level Table for Bilingual Syntax Measure	33
VIII.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance on English Reading (Grade 2)	34
IX.	Results of Bilingual Syntax Measure, Spanish Version	35
X.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance on Spanish Reading (Grade 2)	37
XI.	Two-Way Analysis of Variance on Mathematical Proficiency (Grade 2)	38

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my appreciation to the members of my committee, Dr. Andrew D. Cohen, Dr. Evelyn Hatch, Dr. J. Donald Bowen, and Dr. Luis M. Laosa, for supervising the writing of this thesis. Without their helpful advice and constant support, this study would not have been possible. I also want to thank Phon Khampong who spent innumerable hours helping me in running the computer analysis of the test data. My special thanks also go to the three teachers in the Spanish Immersion Program: Irma Wright, Violet Fier, and Carmen Jarel. Their cooperation and assistance were essential to the success of this study. Most importantly, I would like to thank the children. Their cooperation and enthusiasm convinced me of the merits of an immersion program.

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

A Report on the Culver City Spanish Immersion Program in its Third Year: Its Implications for Language and Subject Matter Acquisition, Language Use, and Attitudes

by

Susan M. Lebach
Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Second Language
University of California, Los Angeles, 1974
Professor Andrew D. Cohen, Chairman

In the fall of 1971, a Spanish Immersion Program was initiated at the Linwood Howe Elementary School in Culver City, California. At that time, a group of monolingual English speakers were taught the regular kindergarten curriculum entirely in Spanish. The original (Pilot) group which began the program in 1971 were in Grade 2 at the time of this study. There were Follow-Up groups at the kindergarten and first-grade levels.

This study focused on the Pilot group at the second-grade level and the Follow-Up group at the first-grade level. The major research questions examined were:

1. Are the students suffering a deficit in English oral and reading skills?

2. How are the students progressing in Spanish oral and reading skills?

3. Are the students achieving at grade level in a non-language subject matter, i.e., mathematics?

4. What are the attitudes of the participating students, teachers, and parents toward the Spanish Immersion Program?

The following instruments were administered for the purpose of evaluation:

1. The Inter-American Tests of Reading, Spanish and English versions.

2. The Bilingual Syntax Measure, English and Spanish versions.

3. The Cooperative Primary Test of Mathematics.

4. Student Interview Form.

5. Teacher Interview Form.

6. Parent Questionnaire.

The findings indicated:

1. The students were not suffering a deficit in English oral or reading skills.

2. The students were progressing satisfactorily in Spanish oral and reading skills.

3. The students were achieving at grade level in mathematics.

4. The students were developing positive attitudes

toward the Spanish language and culture, and toward foreign language learning in general. Both the Immersion teachers and parents strongly supported the program and advocated its continuation.

CHAPTER I

AREA OF INVESTIGATION

Historical Background

While popular in other countries for a number of years, bilingual education has only been actively promoted in the United States since the passage of the Bilingual Education Act in 1968. From 1848 to 1920, several German-English schools were founded, but none survived beyond 1919. Reasons for their failure included: a lack of community involvement, an elitist emphasis on literature and the arts, and the growing unpopularity of Germany resulting from World War I. No major attempts at bilingual public education were made until 1963 when a program was initiated at the Coral Way Elementary School in Dade County, Florida. During the following five years, approximately a dozen bilingual programs were introduced in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California (Andersson and Boyer, 1970).

Since the passage of the Bilingual Education Act, bilingual education has been thought of primarily as a means of compensatory education for school children who are non-native speakers of English. The Draft Guidelines of the Bilingual Education Program define "bilingual education" as follows:

> Bilingual education is instruction in two languages and the use of those languages as mediums of instruction for any part or all of the school curriculum. Study of the history and culture associated with a student's mother tongue is considered an integral part of bilingual education [Andersson and Boyer, Appendix B].

As of November 1973, 213 projects in 32 states and territories were being funded under Title VII of the Act (Wright, 1973).

While all projects under Title VII involve the use of two languages, the amount and method of instruction in the two languages varies enormously in different programs. Models for bilingual education include:

1. Simultaneous translation from one language into the other;
2. Repetition of all subject matter in both languages at different times of the day, e.g., mathematics in Spanish in the morning and in English in the afternoon;
3. Particular subjects reserved for each language, i.e., mathematics is taught in Spanish and science in English;
4. Use of the two languages on alternate days, e.g., English on Monday, Spanish on Tuesday, English on Wednesday, etc.

A particularly successful model of bilingual education, which is not funded under Title VII, is the immersion format. Immersion programs are becoming increasingly popular in Canada. In 1965, under the initiation of parents in the community, the South Shore Protestant Regional Board began its first French immersion classes for a group of kindergarten children. As of the

1972-1973 academic year, this innovative program was being offered through Grade 7 at the St. Lambert Elementary School and in kindergarten through Grade 3 in five other schools in the system. Approximately 49% of all eligible kindergartners on the South Shore were enrolled in immersion programs, and similar programs existed in 14 schools on the island of Montreal (Lambert et al., 1972). The essential elements of immersion programs are:

1. All kindergarten students are monolinguals.

2. The teachers are bilinguals. However, in the classroom they use only the second language being taught to the children. The students are treated as if they were native speakers; teachers speak at a normal conversational speed.

3. In kindergarten and in Grade 1, all instruction is in the child's second language.

4. In kindergarten, the children are permitted to respond in their first language. The teacher often repeats the children's remarks in the second language and always responds in the second language.

5. In Grade 1, the teacher requests that only the second language be spoken by the students.

6. In Grade 1, instruction in reading, writing, and math is presented in the second language.

7. In Grade 2, Language Arts in the first language is introduced.

8. There are no structured second-language lessons

(pattern practice, etc.). The second language is the medium of instruction rather than a separate subject matter.

9. The program follows the regular school curriculum.

After seven years of longitudinal study, the findings of the St. Lambert Immersion Program indicate (Lambert and Tucker, 1972; Bruck et al., 1973; Bruck et al., 1974):

1. The students have suffered no deficit in cognitive development.

2. The students' English language proficiency is comparable to that of monolingual peers receiving all instruction in English.

3. The students' French language proficiency approaches that of native-French-speaking peers. It is significantly better than that of English-speaking peers receiving limited amounts (20-25 minutes daily) of second-language instruction in French.

4. There has been no deficit in the learning of non-language subject matter, i.e., mathematics and science.

5. The children seem satisfied with the program and express no desire to transfer to a conventional program.

6. The children are developing a sensitivity

toward French-and English-Canadians and towards the notion of cultural diversity in general.

Following the model of the St. Lambert Elementary School, the Culver City Public Schools, with consultation and assistance from the Department of Teaching English as a Second Language at the University of California at Los Angeles, began a Spanish Immersion Program at the Linwood Howe Elementary School in 1971. This appears to be the only Spanish immersion program in public education in the United States. It is a district program and has received no federal funding from Title VII or outside funding from private foundations. Studies have been made of the original Pilot group in kindergarten (Cathcart, 1972) and in Grade 1 (Broadbent, 1973; Flores, 1973; Cohen, 1974b). The results of these stuiies indicate that the students:

1. have suffered no retardation in English oral or reading skills,

2. are able to achieve at grade level in a non-language subject matter (math) taught to them in their second language,

3. are effectively learning Spanish.

During the 1973-74 academic year, the Pilot group was in Grade 2, and there were Follow-Up groups at the kindergarten and first-grade level.

Statement of the Research Problem

Whereas both Dr. Wallace E. Lambert, the designer of the St. Lambert French Immersion Program, and Dr. Russell N. Campbell (1972), the promoter of the Culver City Spanish Immersion Program, stress the positive effects of beginning schooling in a second language, other educators have pointed to what they consider to be its detrimental effects. At a UNESCO sponsored meeting in Paris in 1951, specialists in the use of vernacular languages concluded:

> It is axiomatic that the best language for teaching a child is his mother tongue. Psychologically, it is the system of meaningful signs that in his mind works automatically for expression and understanding. Sociologically, it is a means of identification among the members of the community to which he belongs. Educationally, he learns more quickly through it than through an unfamiliar linguistic medium [The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education, 1953, p. 11].

Among the influential spokesmen for bilingual education, the general feeling is that education should be begun in the child's mother tongue. (See, for example, Andersson and Boyer, 1970; Saville and Troike, 1971; John and Horner, 1971; Valencia, 1971; Gudschinsky, 1971.) Studies of specific programs done by Modiano (1968) and Thonis (1970) are cited as supportive evidence.

The debate over the use of one's mother tongue in bilingual education continues. Several important questions need to be answered by further carefully-controlled studies:

1. Will a child's cognitive development be affected by instruction in a second language?

2. Should a child be introduced to reading and writing through his first or second language?

3. If instruction is given in the second language, will students suffer a deficit in the basic skills of their first language?

4. If instruction is given in the second language, will students develop native-like proficiency in that language?

5. Can students achieve at grade-level in non-language subject matter presented to them in their second language?

Purpose of the Study

This study will present an evaluation of the Culver City Spanish Immersion Program in its third year. The evaluation will focus on the Pilot group at the second-grade level and the Follow-Up group at the first-grade level. The research questions will be:

1. Are the students suffering a deficit in English oral and reading skills?

2. How are the students progressing in Spanish oral and reading skills?

3. Are the students achieving at grade level in a non-language subject matter, i.e., mathematics?

4. What are the attitudes of the participating students, teachers, and parents toward the Spanish Immersion Program?

Procedural Statement

The following instruments were administered for the purpose of evaluation:

1. The Inter-American Tests of Reading, English and Spanish versions,

2. The Bilingual Syntax Measure, English and Spanish versions,

3. The Cooperative Primary Tests of Mathematics,

4. Student Interview Form,

5. Teacher Interview Form,

6. Parent Questionnaire.

CHAPTER II

EVALUATION OF ENGLISH, SPANISH, AND MATHEMATICAL PROFICIENCY

Introduction

In the fall of 1971, with the assistance of the Department of Teaching English as a Second Language at the University of California, Los Angeles, the Culver City Unified School District began a Spanish Immersion Program at the Linwood Howe Elementary School. The Spanish Immersion Program was modeled after the St. Lambert project in Montreal, Canada (Lambert and Tucker, 1972). In the St. Lambert project, English-Canadian children were immersed in French instruction beginning in kindergarten. Only at the second-grade level was instruction in English introduced.

During Culver City's 1971-1972 academic year, a Pilot group of 19 five-year old monolingual English speakers were taught the traditional kindergarten curriculum entirely in Spanish. The state-defined curriculum objectives were followed, but modified for presentation in Spanish. In the fall of 1972, 15 English-speaking children from the original Pilot group continued the Immersion Program in Grade 1. They were joined by six native-Spanish-speaking students. Due to parental concern and a compulsory school reading test, daily one-hour periods of

English Language Arts were introduced at the first-grade level. At the time of this study, the Pilot group was in Grade 2; 12 of the original Pilot group and nine native-Spanish speakers were in this second-grade Immersion class. Except for daily one-hour periods of English Language Arts, instruction was presented in Spanish.

During the 1973-1974 academic year, there was not only the Pilot group in Grade 2 but also Follow-Up groups at the kindergarten and first-grade level. The Follow-Up groups had followed the same curriculum as the Pilot group with the exception that English Language Arts were not introduced at the first-grade level. Nineteen Anglos and two native-Spanish speakers were in the Follow-Up first-grade class; 26 Anglos were in the Follow-Up kindergarten class.

In the winter and spring of 1974, a series of tests were administered to the Follow-Up group in Grade 1 and the Pilot group in Grade 2 and to their respective Comparison groups. In replication of the Montreal model (Lambert and Tucker, 1972), kindergarten children were not tested. The evaluation focused on three major questions:

1. Are the students suffering a deficit in English oral and reading skills?
2. How are students progressing in Spanish oral and reading skills?
3. Are the students achieving at grade level in a non-language subject matter, e.g., mathematics?

Since different tests were administered to the Follow-Up and Pilot groups, the two groups will be evaluated separately.

Follow-Up Group in Grade 1

Sample:

Follow-Up group: This group consisted of the 19 Anglo students in the Grade 1 Immersion class at the Linwood Howe Elementary School. These students had received all instruction in Spanish during their kindergarten and first-grade years. Their curriculum, though taught in Spanish, was equivalent to that of the children enrolled in monolingual classes at the same school.

Comparison groups: There were two Comparison groups: one for the tests administered in English and one for tests administered in Spanish.

English Comparison group (EC): The English Comparison group consisted of 18 first-grade students from four different monolingual classes at the Linwood Howe Elementary School. The group included all those native-English-speaking children whose parents had given permission for them to be tested.

Spanish Comparison group (SC): The Spanish Comparison group was made up of 25 native-Spanish-speaking students attending first grade at a private school in Quito, Ecuador. The state-defined curriculum was being

followed. Except for daily twenty-minute periods of English, all instruction was in Spanish.

Materials and Procedures:

1. English Reading Skills

The Inter-American Test of Reading, Level 1 (R-1-CE), (Guidance Testing Associates, Austin, Texas) was selected because it is available in equivalent English and Spanish versions. The test consists of a Vocabulary and a Comprehension section. In the Vocabulary subtest, the children have to match a word with one of four pictures. Eight minutes are allotted to complete the 40 items. In the Comprehension subtest, the children have to match a sentence or sentences with the appropriate picture. Ten minutes are allowed to complete the forty items.

I administered the test to the Follow-Up and English Comparison (EC) group in mid-April in the school library. The test was administered on a group basis, with each group taking the test at a different time.

2. Spanish Reading Skills

Prueba de Lectura, Nivel 1 (L-1-CEs), part of the Inter-American series was selected because the Spanish Nivel 1 format is identical to that of the English Level 1 (see description of English Level 1 above).

With the assistance of the first-grade Immersion teacher, the test was administered on a group basis to the Follow-Up students in mid-April in the school library. The same test was administered in early May to the Spanish comparison (SC) group in Quito, Ecuador.

3. Mathematical Skills

a. The Cooperative Primary Test of Mathematics (Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey) was selected to measure mathematical proficiency. Form 12 A, designed for children in the spring semester of Grade 1 or fall semester of Grade 2, was used for the first-grade students. Rather than measuring computational ability, this instrument measures the comprehension of the following concepts: number, symbolism, operation, function and relation, approximation and estimation, proof, measurements, and geometry. The test consists of two untimed parts. In Part One, the students must respond to an oral cue given by the examiner. They must choose the appropriate picture out of three possibilities. There are 41 items in this part. In Part Two, which consists of 14 items, printed stimulus material is provided, and the student selects the appropriate picture.

Due to the length of the test (about one hour), I administered it in two sessions in mid-April. The first 28 items were administered to the Follow-Up and

English Comparison (EC) groups together in the school cafeteria. Following a short recess, part of the Follow-Up group and the Comparison (EC) group completed the test in the classroom of the Follow-Up students. The remainder of the Follow-Up group completed the test the next day in their classroom; while the remainder of the Comparison (EC) group completed it the next day in the school library.

b. The Wide-Range Achievement Test in Mathematics (Jastak and Jastak, Guidance Associates, Wilmington, Delaware) was individually administered to the Follow-Up and English Comparison (EC) groups in mid-February by the reading specialist at the Linwood Howe Elementary School. This test measures computational ability.

Results (Summary of Results in Table 1):

1. English Reading Skills

The Inter-American Reading Test, Level 1 (R-1-CE), was submitted to a two-way analysis of variance: Group (2) X Subtest (2) (Armor and Couch, 1972). The difference in performance between the Follow-Up and English Comparison (EC) groups was approaching statistical significance ($p < .06$), with the comparison (EC) group scoring higher than the Follow-Up (Table 2). There was no group-subtest interaction. Both groups performed better on the Vocabulary than on the Comprehension section (Table 1).

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF TEST RESULTS
Grade 1

		Follow-Up Group (n=19)	English Comparison (EC) Group (n=18)	Spanish Comparison (SC) Group (n=25)
1. Inter-American Test of Reading (R-1-CE)				
a. Vocabulary	mean	17.21	24.83	
	S.D.	10.78	9.47	
b. Comprehension	mean	12.31	17.72	
	S.D.	11.72	11.66	
c. Total	mean	29.47	42.56	
	S.D.	21.11	20.40	
2. Prueba De Lectura (L-1-CEs)				
a. Vocabulary	mean	18.94		36.88
	S.D.	12.03		2.52
b. Comprehension	mean	12.84		33.64
	S.D.	8.92		4.07
c. Total	mean	31.78		70.52
	S.D.	20.17		5.23
3. Cooperative Primary Test in Mathematics 12 A	mean	17.78 Grade equivalent=	19.06 Grade equ. =	
	S.D.	7.85 Grade 1, 8th month	6.44 Grade 1, 9th month	

TABLE 1 (Continued)

			Follow-Up Group	English Comparison (EC) Group	Spanish Comparison (SC) Group
4.	Wide-Range Achievement Test in Mathematics	mean	18.52 Grade Equ. = Grade 1, 9th month	19.44 Grade Equ. = Grade 1, 9th month	
		S.D.	4.08	4.03	

TABLE 2

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

ON ENGLISH READING

Grade 1

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-test
GROUP (Follow-Up X English Comparison)	784.57	1	784.57	3.76
SUBTESTS (Vocabulary, Comprehension)	666.16	1	666.16	21.34***
GROUP X SUBTEST	22.70	1	22.70	.72

*** $p < .001$

2. Spanish Reading Skills

The Prueba de Lectura, Nivel 1 (L-1-CEs), was submitted to a two-way analysis of variance. The difference between the Follow-Up and Comparison (SC) group was of statistical significance ($p < .001$), with the Ecuadorian Comparison (SC) group scoring higher (Table 3). The group-subtest interaction was non-significant. Both groups scored higher on the Vocabulary than the Comprehension section (Table 1).

A SPSS Pearson Correlation Program (Nie and Hadlai, 1972) was calculated between the English and Spanish reading scores of the Follow-Up students. Their scores in Spanish reading correlated positively and significantly with those in English reading ($r = .72$ for Vocabulary; $r = .75$ for Comprehension; $r = .80$ for Total; $p < .001$ for all three correlations).

3. Mathematical Skills

When the Cooperative Primary Test in Mathematics and the Wide-Range Achievement in Mathematics were submitted to a two-way analysis of variance, no statistical significance was found between the Culver City Immersion and Comparsion groups, nor was there group-test interaction (Table 4). (Raw scores were converted to grade-equivalent scores for statistical analysis.)

TABLE 3

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

ON SPANISH READING

Grade 1

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-test
GROUP (Follow-Up X Spanish Comparison (SC))	8096.87	1	8096.87	85.28***
SUBTESTS (Vocabulary, Comprehension)	471.40	1	471.40	32.99***
GROUP X SUBTEST	44.31	1	44.31	3.10

***p < .001

TABLE 4

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

ON MATHEMATICAL PROFICIENCY

Grade 1

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-test
GROUP (Follow-Up X English Comparison)	22.05	1	22.05	.45
TESTS (Cooperative Primary Test, 12A; Wide-Range Achievement Test	5.86	1	5.86	.29
GROUP X TEST	.56	1	.56	.03

Discussion:

1. English Reading Skills

The somewhat lower performance of the Follow-Up group on the English reading test was expected since the group had received no formal reading instruction in English. According to the St. Lambert model (Lambert and Tucker, 1972), English reading is only to be introduced in Grade 2. An initial lag in English reading was found not only in the Spanish Immersion Program at the Linwood Howe Elementary School but also in French immersion programs at the St. Lambert Elementary School in Montreal, Canada (Lambert and Tucker, 1972) and the Allenby School in Ottowa, Canada (Barik et al., 1974).

2. Spanish Reading Skills

The Follow-Up students' proficiency in Spanish reading skills was not equivalent to that of native Spanish-speaking students in Quito, Ecuador. However, when the Follow-Up group's scores are compared with those of Mexican-Americans in California, the Follow-Up group is in the 75th percentile or above in the two subtests, Vocabulary and Comprehension, and in the total test. (These percentiles are found in the "California Report" (1973) of the Guidance Testing Associates. The authors warn that the figures are to be used as illustrations rather than regional norms.)

The strong correlation between the Follow-Up

students' scores in Spanish and English reading suggests a possible transfer of skills from one language to the other. A similar correlation was found in the Pilot group in Grade 1 (Cohen, 1974b). At the St. Lambert Elementary School, a comparable correlation was found between French and English reading. Referring to the results of the Pilot group in Grade 1, Lambert and Tucker conclude, "These findings produce strong evidence for a transfer of skills from French to English, especially since the parents had been urged not to introduce or encourage English reading at home [Lambert and Tucker, 1972, p. 36]." The Rizal experiment in the Philippines (Davis, 1967) further supports this theory. Dr. Robert Wilson, the founder of Consultants in Total Education, Inc., believes that it is easier to transfer from a second language back to the first than the reverse. He states,

> After presentation in English, the learners are transferring to Spanish themselves, and therefore saving a lot of time. But if they start with Spanish, the effort has to come from the outside. It can't be done by the children themselves [Cohen, 1974a].

3. Mathematical Skills

The Follow-Up group was performing at grade level in tests of mathematical skills. At the first-grade level, French immersion groups in Montreal (Lambert and Tucker, 1972) and Ottowa (Barik et al., 1974) also performed at grade level in mathematics.

However, Macnamara (1966 and 1967), in studying students in Ireland, obtained different findings. He was evaluating the mathematical proficiency of boys from English-speaking homes who had been taught arithemtic in Irish. Macnamara (1966) discovered that these students scored lower in problem-solving, but not computational ability, than their peers receiving arithemtic instruction in English. In a later study (1967), he concluded that though the students had received arithmetic instruction in Irish, they still had difficulty reading Irish versions of problems aloud.

Unlike the students in the Macnamara study (1967), the Follow-Up group was administered the mathematical tests in their first rather than second language. One might have expected the Follow-Up group to have difficulty with the first part of the Cooperative Primary Test in Mathematics because the oral stimuli were presented in English. However, the students were able to transfer concepts they had learned in Spanish into English. It would be interesting to administer an equivalent mathematical test in Spanish to ascertain if there would be any significant difference in results.

Pilot Group in Grade 2

Sample:

Pilot Group: This group consisted of the 12 Anglo students from the original Pilot group which began the kindergarten Immersion Program in the fall of 1971. Until January of Grade 1, they received the regular school curriculum in Spanish. In January of 1973, due to parental concern and a compulsory school reading test, English reading was introduced for one-hour periods daily. The daily one-hour periods of English Language Arts were continued in Grade 2. At the time of this study, the Pilot group was in the second-grade Immersion class.

Comparison Groups: There were three Comparison groups: one for tests administered in English and two for tests administered in Spanish.

English Comparison group (EC): The English Comparison group consisted of 14 second-grade students from three different monolingual classes at the Linwood Howe Elementary School. The group included all those native-English speaking children whose parents had given permission for them to be tested.

Spanish Comparison groups (SC):

Ecuadorian Comparison group (SC): This group was made up of 25 native Spanish-speaking students attending the first grade at a private school in Quito,

Ecuador. The state-defined curriculum was being followed. Except for daily twenty-minute periods of English, all instruction was in Spanish.

Immersion Comparison group (ISC): This group consisted of the nine native-Spanish-speaking students in the second-grade Immersion class. Six had joined the program in Grade 1 and three in Grade 2.

Materials and Procedures :

1. English Oral Skills

The English version of the Bilingual Syntax Measure (Burt, Dulay, and Hernández Ch. 1973) was administered. The authors kindly allowed me to use the test in pilot form. The test is designed to determine a child's structural language development. It is administered individually and requires approximately 15 minutes per child. There are similar versions of the test in Spanish and English. A picture booklet, containing seven cartoon-like drawings, is used in the test administration. The examiner asks the examinee 33 questions while pointing to the appropriate pictures. The child's responses are recorded in the Child's Response Booklet. There are no "correct" answers; the student is encouraged to express any opinions he has. The structure rather than the content of the child's speech is evaluated.

Patricia Boyd, a graduate student at the University

of California, Los Angeles, and I administered the English version of the Bilingual Syntax Measure in late February, one week after the Spanish version had been administered. The authors of the test suggested that the test first be given in the child's weaker language.

2. English Reading Skills

The Inter-American Test of Reading, Level 2 (R-2-CE), was administered on a group basis. Level 2, designed for children in the spring semester of Grade 2 or fall semester of Grade 3, consists of three sections. In the first section, Level of Comprehension, the student matches a word, phrase, sentence or paragraph to one of four pictures. Ten minutes are allotted for the 40 items. In the second subtest, Speed of Comprehension, the student reads a paragraph and chooses the correct picture out of four possibilities. Only five minutes are allotted for the 30 items. In the third section, Vocabulary, a visual cue is given, and the student has to match it with the correct word out of four choices. The 40 items are to be completed within eight minutes.

I administered the test to the Pilot and the English Comparison (EC) groups in mid-April. The groups were given the test separately in the school library.

3. Spanish Oral Skills

The Spanish version of the Bilingual Syntax Measure was individually administered in late February, one week before the English version. (The test is described in detail on page 25.) Two native-Spanish speakers administered the test to the Pilot group and six students from the Immersion Comparison group (ISC).

4. Spanish Reading Skills

The Prueba de Lectura, Nivel 2 (L-2-CEs) was administered in mid-April. The Spanish format is identical to the English one. I administered the test to the Pilot and Immersion Comparison groups together in the school library. The test was administered to the Ecuadorian Comparison group (SC) in early May.

5. Mathematical Skills

a. The Cooperative Primary Test of Mathematics, Form 23A, was administered on a group basis in mid-April. The 23A form, designed for students in the spring semester of Grade 2 or beginning of Grade 3, contains 43 items in Part One and 17 items in Part Two. Otherwise, the test is similar in format to the 12A version. With the assistance of the second-grade Immersion teacher, I administered the test to the Pilot and English Comparison (EC) groups in the school cafeteria.

b. The Wide-Range Achievement Test in

Mathematics, a test of computational ability, was individually administered in mid-February to the Pilot and English Comparsion (EC) groups by the reading specialist at the Linwood Howe Elementary School.

Results (Summary of Results in Table 5):

1. English Oral Skills

The scores on the Bilingual Syntax Measure (Table 6) are difficult to interpret without prior knowledge of the scoring procedures. A detailed scoring list is provided with the test. Certain linguistic elements, such as uninflected verbs and nouns, are worth one point; tense endings are worth two points; possessive pronouns are worth three points. Six steps are involved in the scoring of the total test:

1. The test scorer first corrects the child's response. He only corrects the essential elements, staying as close as possible to the child's original response. This corrected form, called the "developed form" is given a "Developed Form Value" (DFV).
2. The child's original response is given a "Child Response Value" (CRV).
3. All the CRV points are added up.
4. All the DFV points are added up.
5. The total CRV is divided by the total DFV,

TABLE 5
SUMMARY OF TEST RESULTS
Grade 2

		Pilot Group	Eng. Comp. (EC)	Spanish Comparison (SC)	Immersion Comparison (ISC)
Inter-American Test of Reading (R-2-CE)		(N=12)	(N=14)	(N=25)	(N=9)
a. Level of Comprehension	mean	24.42	21.07		
	S.D.	10.40	9.54		
b. Speed of Comprehension	mean	12.25	11.93		
	S.D.	8.13	6.11		
c. Vocabulary	mean	27.50	21.78		
	S.D.	8.51	9.43		
d. Total	mean	64.08	54.79		
	S.D.	25.34	23.22		
Prueba de Lectura (L-2-CEs)					
a. Level of Comprehension	mean	25.25		28.68	17.78
	S.D.	9.33		6.74	7.17
b. Speed of Comprehension	mean	16.42		23.72	12.67
	S.D.	8.63		5.82	9.76
c. Vocabulary	mean	21.58		33.60	21.67
	S.D.	8.34		3.18	6.65
d. Total	mean	63.25		86.40	55.44
	S.D.	24.67		13.07	21.99

TABLE 5 (Continued)

		Pilot Group	Eng. Comp. (EC)	Spanish Comparison (SC)	Immersion Comparison (ISC)
Cooperative Primary Test in Mathematics, 23A	mean	29.83*	21.21**		
	S.D.	11.88	8.97		
Wide-Range Achievement Test in Mathematics	mean	32.75***	28.00****		
	S.D.	3.70	4.17		

*(Grade equivalent = Grade 2, 10th month)

**(Grade equivalent = Grade 2, 1st month)

***(Grade equivalent = Grade 3, 3rd month)

****(Grade equivalent = Grade 2, 8th month)

TABLE 6
BILINGUAL SYNTAX MEASURE ENGLISH VERSION
Grade 2

Students in Pilot Group	Child Response Value (CRV)	Developed Form Value (DFV)	Percent	Level
1	239.00	249.00	99	5
2	175.50	182.00	96	5
3	198.00	205.00	97	5
4	234.00	238.00	98	5
5	222.00	226.00	98	5
6	203.50	208.00	98	5
7	249.50	250.00	98	5
8	220.00	223.00	98	5
9	211.00	215.00	98	5
10	199.00	204.00	98	5
11	223.50	226.00	99	5
12	191.00	194.00	98	5

and the result is expressed as a whole number.

6. The child is placed at a certain level according to the Level Table (Table 7).

According to the norms of the pilot version of the test, all the children in the Pilot group placed in the highest level. However, the test was only a restricted edition, and the norms were not explained in the test information. Based on field testing of the restricted edition, new norms were being established but were not yet available at the completion of this study.

2. English Reading Skills

According to a two-way analysis of variance, there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of the Follow-Up and English Comparison (EC) groups (Table 8). There was no group-subtest interaction.

3. Spanish Oral Skills

In the Pilot group, seven students placed in Level 5 and five in Level 4. All the native-Spanish speakers in the Immersion Comparison group (ISC) placed in Level 5 (Table 9).

4. Spanish Reading Skills

According to a two-way analysis of variance, there was a significant difference between the scores of

TABLE 7

BILINGUAL SYNTAX MEASURE LEVEL TABLE

Level 1 - Less than three responses out of the first seven questions in any language.

Level 2 - a. At least 3 but not more than 16 responses in any language out of the 33 BSM questions.

b. Almost all or all of the questions in the "wrong" language

c. More than 16 responses marked unscorable.

Level 3 - 40-69

Level 4 - 70-85

Level 5 - 86-100

TABLE 8

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON ENGLISH READING

Grade 2

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-test
GROUP (Pilot X English Comparison)	189.55	1	189.55	.96
SUBTESTS (Level, Speed, Vocabulary)	2366.83	2	1183.42	69.07•••
GROUP X SUBTEST	94.42	2	47.21	2.76

•••p < .001

TABLE 9

BILINGUAL SYNTAX MEASURE SPANISH VERSION

Grade 2

Students in Pilot Group	Child Response Value (CRV)	Developed Form Value (DFV)	Percent	Level
1	147.50	174.00	85	4
2	130.00	153.00	85	4
3	158.00	181.00	87	5
4	200.00	232.00	86	5
5	206.00	226.50	91	5
6	200.50	226.50	91	5
7	238.50	273.00	87	5
8	207.00	239.00	87	5
9	124.50	165.00	75	4
10	204.50	235.50	87	5
11	151.00	177.00	85	4
12	169.00	202.00	84	4
Students in Immersion Comparison Group				
1	189.50	192.00	98	5
2	216.00	220.00	98	5
3	180.50	184.00	98	5
4	199.00	201.00	99	5
5	177.50	191.00	93	5
6	223.50	228.00	98	5

the Pilot and Ecuadorian Comparison (SC) groups ($p < .001$ Table 10), and there was group-subtest interaction.

When the scores of the Pilot and Immersion Comparison (ISC) group were submitted to a two-way analysis of variance, the difference was non-significant (Table 10), but there was group-subtest interaction.

The Pilot group's scores in Spanish reading correlated positively and significantly with English reading scores (Level of Comprehension: $r = .96$, sig. = .01; Speed of Comprehension: $r = .89$. sig. = .001; Vocabulary: $r = .72$, sig. = .007; Total: $r = .94$, sig. = .001).

5. Mathematical Skills

When the scores of the Cooperative Primary Test in Mathematics and the Wide-Range Achievement Test in Mathematics were submitted to a two-way analysis of variance, the results indicated a significant difference between the Pilot and English Comparison (EC) groups ($p < .01$), with the Pilot group scoring higher than the English (EC) Comparison group. There was no group-test interaction (Table 11). (Raw scores were converted to grade-equivalent scores for statistical analysis.)

Discussion

1. English Oral Skills

TABLE 10

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SPANISH READING
Grade 2

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-test
GROUP (Pilot X Spanish Comparison (SC)	1398.81	1	1398.81	13.911***
SUBTESTS (Level, Speed, Vocabulary)	1130.35	2	565.18	33.90***
GROUP X SUBTEST	299.86	2	149.93	8.99***
GROUP (Pilot X Immersion Comparison (ISC))	212.70	1	212.70	1.22
SUBTESTS (Level, Speed, Vocabulary)	677.47	2	338.73	16.777***
GROUP X SUBTEST	146.80	2	73.40	3.635*

*p < .05
***p < .001

TABLE 11

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON MATHEMATICAL PROFICIENCY

Grade 2

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-test
GROUP (Pilot X English Comparison)	577.44	1	577.44	8.08**
TESTS (Cooperative Primary Test, 23A; Wide-Range Achievement Test)	304.13	1	304.13	5.80*
GROUP X TEST	48.36	1	48.36	.92

*p < .05

**p < .01

The test data revealed that the Pilot group was not suffering any deficit in native-language oral skills. Since all the students placed in the highest level, it was not considered necessary to test the English Comparison (EC) group.

2. English Reading Skills

Whereas the reading scores for the Follow-Up group in Grade 1 approached statistical significance, with the Follow-Up group scoring lower than the Anglo Comparison group, there was no statistical difference between the Pilot and Comparison (EC) group at the second-grade level. Similarly, in the French immersion projects in Montreal, Canada (Lambert and Tucker, 1972) and Toronto, Canada (Barik et al., 1973), the initial lag in English reading disappeared by the end of Grade 2.

In the Culver City Spanish Immersion Program, English reading was introduced to the Pilot group in January of the first grade. In Grade 2, the last hour of the school day was reserved for English Language Arts. Initially, the regular immersion second-grade teacher took the children to another room in the school, referred to as the "magic room," for their English Language Arts. Later, this idea was abandoned and English instruction was given in their regular classroom. The introduction of English reading in Grade 1 as well as the lack of a

special teacher for English instruction represent deviations from the St. Lambert model; there, English reading is begun in Grade 2 and the teacher is a monolingual English speaker.

3. Spanish Oral Skills

Due to the lack of carefully-established norms, the results of the tests are difficult to interpret. Nevertheless, they do indicate that the Pilot group was advancing quite satisfactorily in Spanish oral skills. The difference in levels between the native-English and native-Spanish groups was not great. (See Boyd, forthcoming, for a detailed description of the errors made by native and non-native Spanish speakers.)

4. Spanish Reading Skills

At the first-grade level, there had been no significant difference between the scores of the Pilot group and a Comparison group of native-Spanish speakers from Guayaquil, Ecuador (Cohen, 1974b). Unfortunately, the same Comparison group was not available at the second-grade level. Consequently, a new group of native-Spanish-speaking children from Quito, Ecuador (SC) was used for comparison purposes. The scores of the Pilot group differed significantly from the Quito Comparison (SC) group; in Grade 2, the Pilot students were not reading at the same level as native-Spanish-speaking peers from Ecuador.

When the subtests are ranked according to percentage of correct answers, the Comparison group from Quito (SC) scored best on Vocabulary; then, Speed of Comprehension; and finally, Level of Comprehension. One would expect students to have greater difficulty with Speed than Level of Comprehension. (Both the Pilot group and the Immersion Comparison (ISC) group performed better on Level than Speed.) Unfortunately, no details were available about the test administration; one suspects that the subtests may not have been timed, even though instructions were provided in Spanish.

Whereas the Pilot students were not reading at the same level as native-Spanish second-graders in Ecuador, they were performing comparably to the nine native-Spanish speakers in their second-grade Immersion class. When the mean scores (Table 5) of the two groups are compared, the scores of the Pilot group are higher in both Level and Speed of Comprehension; their scores on the Vocabulary subtest differ only slightly. These results seem to indicate that the native-Spanish speakers have comprehension problems.

In a study of Mexican-American children in California (GTA, 1973), the findings revealed that Mexican-Americans generally have difficulty both in Spanish and English reading skills. When the scores of the Pilot group are compared with those of the Mexican-American children used in this study, the Pilot group is at the

90th percentile in all three subtests and the total. (It should be emphasized that the report points out that the figures should be used as illustrations rather than norms.)

In summary, while the Pilot students in Grade 2 were not reading at a level comparable to native-Spanish speakers in Ecuador, their reading level was comparable to the native-Spanish speakers in their Immersion class. Moreover, they scored better than 90% of the Mexican-Americans involved in a study carried out by the Guidance Testing Associates (1973). It should also be noted that the Pilot students were reading at equivalent levels in Spanish and English.

5. Mathematical Skills

The Pilot group scored significantly better than the English Comparison (EC) group. Rather than having suffered a lack of proficiency in mathematical skills, the Pilot group was performing above grade level.

CHAPTER III

STUDENT, TEACHER, AND PARENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE SPANISH IMMERSION PROGRAM

Statement of the Research Problem

The test results in Chapter II indicated the academic success of the Spanish Immersion Program. In this chapter, the effect of the program on the attitudes of the students, teachers, and parents will be reported.

Numerous educators (Goodman, 1960; Holt, 1964; Postman and Weingartner, 1969) stress the importance of motivation and attitudes in education. Jakobovits (1970) and Lambert and Gardner (1972) focus on the crucial role of motivation and attitudes in second-language learning. Not only the students' attitudes but also the teachers' are considered significant.

> There can be no significant innovation in education that does not have at its center the attitudes of teachers, and it is an illusion to think otherwise. The beliefs, feelings, and assumptions of teachers are the air of a learning environment; they determine the quality of life within it [Postman and Weingartner, p. 33].

The presence or absence of parental support can also be a crucial factor in the child's academic success.

Past Research Undertaken at the Spanish Immersion Program

In the previous studies of the Spanish Immersion Program, rather limited attention was focused on the attitudes of the students, teachers, and parents. A Cross-Cultural Attitudes Inventory was administered to the Pilot group and a Comparison group in kindergarten. The Pilot group responded more positively toward Mexican-American items than the Comparison (Cathcart, 1973). The results were cited as evidence that the children in the Immersion Program were developing positive attitudes toward Mexican-Americans. However, the children were five and six years old when given the test, and it has not been re-administered.

Unfortunately, during the first two years of the program, the Immersion teachers were neither interviewed nor asked to complete questionnaires. Violet Fier, the first-grade teacher, co-authored an article (Cohen, Fier, and Flores, 1973) and has written her Master's Thesis on the Spanish Immersion Program. In her thesis, she presents an overview of the program (Fier, forthcoming).

The parents of children in the Pilot and Comparison kindergarten completed questionnaires regarding their educational background, their educational aspirations for their child, and the child's pre-school experience. Analysis of the home background data indicated that the two groups were reasonably similar (Broadbent, 1973).

The Immersion parents were presented with a questionnaire concerning their reasons for having their child learn Spanish. Their reasons in order of preference were:

1. To meet and converse with more varied people.
2. To understand Mexican-American people.
3. To make Spanish-speaking friends.
4. To get a job.
5. It may be needed for a specific business or educational goal.
6. To be really educated, one must speak a foreign language.
7. To aid social recognition.
8. So one can think and behave like a Mexican-American [Cathcart, 1972].

Lambert and Gardner (1972) categorize orientations to language learning as either integrative or instrumental. Integrative learning is based on a desire to identify with, or at least sympathetically understand, a different cultural group; whereas instrumental learning is directed toward some specific use of the language to gain social or economic advancement. According to these definitions, the parent's motivation was primarily integrative, directed to cultural understanding rather than to career or professional advancement.

Purpose of Present Study and Procedures

The purpose of this study is to examine in more specific detail the student, teacher, and parent attitudes

in the third year of the Immersion Program.

Procedures:

1. Students: The 12 native English-speaking children (Pilot group) in the second-grade Immersion class were individually interviewed for 15-minute sessions. (Younger children were not interviewed because it was felt that they would not be able to articulate their attitudes effectively.) Direct questions were asked (Appendix I), but the students were encouraged to include additional information. Certain questions had to be modified when students did not respond and seemed not to understand. The most important problem was getting the children to feel at ease. I had spent many hours in the second-grade Immersion class and was thus on familiar terms with all the students. A few students were initially nervous because of the use of a tape recorder. However, all interviews continued on a friendly, comfortable basis. I did the interviewing at the beginning of February in a small room in the school.

2. Teachers: I interviewed the three teachers together in two one-hour sessions. Three days before the actual interview, each teacher was given a copy of the interview form (Appendix II). Originally, the questions were designed for written responses, but the teachers felt that a tape-recorded interview would be easier than

writing individual answers and seemed to prefer having the mutual support of a group interview. The two interviewing sessions took place in mid-February in a small room at the school and at the home of the first-grade Immersion teacher.

3. Parents: At a meeting of Immersion parents at the beginning of February, questionnaires (Appendix III) were distributed to parents of children in all three Immersion classes. Additional questionnaires were sent to those parents who were not at the meeting. Thirty four out of 65 families completed and returned the questionnaires.

Findings

The findings of the interviews and questionnaires were difficult to summarize because the questions were generally open-ended and could not be statistically analyzed. The results will focus on the following issues:

1. The students' progress in learning Spanish.
2. The students' use of Spanish inside and outside the school.
3. The students' attitudes toward the Immersion Program, toward Spanish, and toward foreign-language learning in general.

The most interesting information comes from the students. After all, the schools are for the students, not the

parents or teachers. Consequently, this study will focus on the learner, though significant information from the parents and teachers will be included. For the sake of clarity, the attitudinal information has been organized around 8 key questions:

1. Did the students have problems understanding Spanish?
2. Did the students have difficulty expressing themselves in Spanish?
3. Could the students read more easily in Spanish or English?
4. Could the students write more easily in Spanish or English?
5. What percentage of class time did the native English speakers spend speaking Spanish?
6. How much exposure to Spanish was there outside of school?
7. What were the students' feelings toward the Immersion Program? and

   Did they like receiving all instruction in Spanish?
8. Did the students want to learn still another foreign language? and

   What were the students' reasons for learning a foreign language?

1. <u>Did the students have problems understanding Spanish</u>?

One expects the first day in a Spanish Immersion Program to be an unpleasant shock for a native-English-speaking child. However, only three of the 12 children admitted that they were frightened in kindergarten, and

all three insisted that they were only frightened the first day. One boy commented, "I thought 'How am I gonna learn that?' . . . just for a day . . . . When they called my name, I thought they said, 'He's stupid.'" (Esteban, the child's Spanish name, sounded like "He's stupid" to the child.) In Grade 1, two students initially had problems adjusting to their new teacher. At the Grade 2 level, only one girl expressed particular difficulty understanding her teacher and native Spanish-speaking classmates. The other students mentioned occasional problems understanding when the teacher and native speakers spoke rapidly. However, they insisted that they "hardly" had any problems.

All three teachers in the program spoke Spanish at normal conversational speed; no adjustments were made for non-native speakers. Irma Wright, the kindergarten teacher, noted that students quickly comprehended instructions and the needs of their immediate environment. She insisted, "If we kept on thinking about somebody not understanding, we'd be more likely to give up on someone." The first-grade teacher reported that by the end of Grade 1, the students understood everything, including a conversation between two of the Immersion teachers.

2. Did the students have problems speaking Spanish?

While 11 of the 12 students admitted having some difficulty speaking Spanish, none seemed frustrated by an inability to express themselves. The principal problem was insufficient vocabulary. However, one bright student even commented on grammatical problems: "Whenever I say comer, I say comerla, and that's not right." Nevertheless, there was no preference for speaking English. Only half of the students felt that English was easier. Two felt that Spanish was easier and two that both languages were equally easy. One girl's response effectively summarized the general attitude, "I speak both languages good."

The teachers agreed with the students' self-evaluations; none of the students had major difficulties speaking Spanish. The teachers felt that the verbal, aggressive children progressed most rapidly in speaking ability. However, by the end of the kindergarten year, all students were using Spanish words and phrases, and some were forming sentences. By the end of Grade 1, all students were able to form sentences in Spanish. Although they mimicked different verb tenses, made numerous grammatical and morphological errors, and sometimes used inappropriate words, the first and second graders were able to communicate effectively (see Boyd, forthcoming).

The tremendous progress achieved in Grade 1 was in part due to a change in teaching strategy. In kindergarten, the teacher allowed the children to speak English but responded to them in Spanish. Initially, she had not reacted to the children's English, but the subsequent misunderstandings were overwhelming. All three teachers agreed that the kindergarten children should not be forced to speak Spanish because of the other adjustment problems which they face during their first year of school. However, in first grade, it was imperative that the students speak Spanish. The children assumed that Violet Fier, their first grade teacher, did not understand or speak English. Carmen Jarel, the second grade teacher, insisted, "If they knew Violet spoke English, they would speak English to her. They need the frustration." Oral Spanish was never drilled by the teachers. When a child was trying to communicate, he was never interrupted. Only during a directed activity would the teacher correct oral errors and ask the student to repeat the word or phrase.

3. Could students read more easily in Spanish or English?

Ten out of the 12 students felt that they read better in Spanish than English. The children were aware that written Spanish is phonetically more regular than English. One student remarked, "In English, you can't

sound 'em [the words] out, but in Spanish, you know just everything." There was no major preference for reading in either language: five preferred English; three, Spanish; four, no preference. The main reason for preferring English was greater familiarity with English words. As one student commented, "Some of the [Spanish] words you don't know, and you don't know what happens." Nonetheless, none of the students expressed serious problems reading in either language.

The teachers agreed that there were neither serious reading problems nor outstanding differences in reading ability in the two languages. In the test findings (Chapter II), Spanish reading scores correlated positively and significantly with English reading scores. All three teachers firmly believed that English reading should only be introduced at the second-grade level. The first-grade teacher insisted that the simultaneous introduction of reading in the two languages had caused interference. There was both English interference in Spanish, e.g., pronunciation of the "h" in hay and hora, and Spanish interference in English, e.g., the pronunciation of "j" like a Spanish "jota." The second-grade teacher emphatically stated,

> They [the children] will transfer [reading skills from one language to the other]. They do not need it [English reading] because they're getting two new things, brand new at the same time, which can be very confusing for such a small child.

> Let them get one down pat, which is phonetic in Spanish, and they will transfer.

Only three out of 34 parents expressed concern with their child's progress in reading. Two felt that their children were not as good in English reading as children in a conventional classroom at the Linwood Howe School. Both were parents of current first graders and realized that English reading was not part of the first-grade curriculum. The parent of a bilingual first-grader felt that her daughter was reading better in Spanish than English. The remainder of the parents appeared satisfied with the reading program, with one parent even commenting that her child was doing better than expected. Another parent of a first-grader related an anecdote about her son: One evening he read an English book to her. When she asked where he had learned to read in English, he answered, "in school." Yet no formal English reading instruction was being offered in his class. Of course, English reading material is available in the homes, and 32% of the parents reported having taught their children to read even though one of the guidelines of the program had been to discourage parents from teaching reading. All but two parents regularly read to their child in English. The 16 parents who report reading to their child in Spanish do it only rarely.

4. Could the students write more easily in Spanish or English?

Fifty percent of the students felt that writing in Spanish was easier than English because: "The spelling is easier"; I know how to sound 'em [Spanish words] out." However, other students felt their limited Spanish vocabulary was a problem, although one student insisted that she knew more Spanish than English words. Over half (7 out of 12) of the students said they preferred writing in Spanish to English.

The teachers felt that the students wrote at the same level in the two languages and were equally willing to write in either language. While their spelling was better in Spanish, structural and mechanical errors in the two languages were comparable. The teachers regarded the children's creativity in the two languages as too subjective to judge.

Only two parents commented that their children were having problems with writing. Unfortunately, they did not specify the type of problem: spelling, mechanics, or structure. Nonetheless, no parent expressed major concern.

5. What percentage of class time was spent speaking Spanish?

At the Grade 2 level, only Spanish was to be spoken in the classroom other than during the last hour

of the day which was reserved for English Language Arts. However, the students admitted that they used both Spanish and English in the classroom. To those native Spanish-speaking classmates who had difficulties with English, they would always speak Spanish. However, to their other classmates, they would sometimes speak English but quickly switch to Spanish if the teacher was nearby. There were no particular topics that they preferred to discuss in either Spanish or English. One student said he spoke English when he got "carried away." While the students agreed that English was primarily spoken during recess, lunch, and English Language Arts period, one student mentioned that "sometimes during recess, it pops right at me in Spanish."

The teachers insisted that the children spoke only Spanish in the classroom, with occasional slips into English. It was understandable that the teachers were not aware of the use of English in the classroom because of the children's automatic switch to Spanish when the teacher approached.

I observed the second-grade Immersion class from September until May 1974 and felt that the children used Spanish and English in free variation in the classroom. In late April and early May, I administered a Language Use Observation Instrument, designed by Cohen (1974c), to obtain a measure of the language use of the children in two different contexts: Spanish Language Arts and English

Language Arts. I observed 10 students for one minute (after the child began talking) in each of the two settings on three different days. I noted the language spoken (Spanish or English) and to whom the child spoke (a native-English speaker or a native-Spanish speaker).

The findings support the children's self-reports. During Spanish Language Arts, Spanish is spoken 61% of the time and English 39%. Thus, a substantial amount of time is spent speaking English. During English Language Arts, it was surprising to discover that Spanish was spoken 45% of the time. The students did not immediately switch to English; instead they continued to use the two languages in free variation. This can be accounted for by the similar language use pattern of the second-grade teacher during the English hour. She constantly switched back and forth rather than speaking only English. This same teacher was responsible for both Spanish and English Language Arts. (At the St. Lambert Elementary School, there is a separate teacher for English Language Arts.)

One should also note that the native-English speakers primarily speak Spanish to their native-Spanish speaking classmates. Consequently, not only their teacher but also their peers served as speech models. The interaction between the Anglos and Latins promoted both use of Spanish and better understanding between the groups. The children repeatedly helped each other out with language

problems. As the second-grade teacher stressed: "The automatic segregation that occurs in a bilingual program does not occur in our program. Anglo children and Spanish-speaking children are interacting. They are equals."

6. How much exposure to Spanish was there outside of school?

Of major concern was not only the students' use of Spanish in school but also outside of school. The students were asked about their exposure to Spanish on T.V., radio, in Spanish-speaking environments, among friends, and in their homes.

All but one student reported having watched Spanish T.V., but none watched it frequently. One said he watched when his Spanish-speaking friends were visiting; another said he watched with his mother (who is Mexican-American) and that he translated for his brother. Five students felt that the speakers on Spanish programs were difficult to understand because they spoke rapidly. However, one student insisted, "I can understand just as good as in English." Similarly, he remarked that Spanish radio programs were not hard to comprehend. Only three of his classmates reported listening to Spanish radio, and two of them felt that the programs were difficult to understand. Half of the students said that they had Spanish records which they listened to "often," and seven had

Spanish reading material at home which they read and enjoyed.

The students also reported using Spanish in Mexican or Spanish restaurants. All but one had been to a Mexican or Spanish restaurant, and eight of them had actually spoken up in Spanish there. One reported his disappointment when he spoke to a Mexican waiter in Spanish, and the waiter answered in English. Another commented about her visits to a particular Mexican restaurant: "Everyone who knows I speak Spanish adores me. I don't know why."

Apart from their native Spanish-speaking friends at school, seven had additional Spanish-speaking friends. When the seven were asked whether they spoke Spanish or English with these friends, five said "English," one said "Spanish," and one said "both." The child who answered Spanish explained that his neighbor was from Chile and did not understand English. The girl who spoke both Spanish and English said that she did so with her baby-sitter who spoke both. The children's reasons for speaking English included: "because they're [the Spanish-speaking friends] in an English school, and so they speak English after school"; "because I'm teaching them some things." Eight of the children indicated that they would like to have more Spanish-speaking friends. One boy liked the games they played better, and another generally preferred Spanish-speaking to English-speaking friends.

Nonetheless, three students expressed a preference for English-speaking friends because they had enough of Spanish in school.

While the students reported that Spanish was occasionally spoken in their homes, they explained that the use of Spanish was treated as a game rather than a seriously planned effort. The students were anxious to teach Spanish to other members of their family. Ten of the 12 students had taught their parents, brothers, and sisters words, songs, and the Pledge of Allegiance in Spanish.

The parents' reports of the children's use of Spanish outside of the classroom closely paralleled those of the children. The parents reported that the majority of students did not regularly watch Spanish T. V. or listen to Spanish radio, but the majority did listen to Spanish records. One parent mentioned that his child translated the songs into English for the rest of the family. Less than half the parents (16 out of 34) indicated that their children had Spanish-speaking friends apart from their classmates in the Immersion Program. From their limited observations of the children playing, the parents felt that the students spoke mainly English with these friends. Twenty six out of the thirty four families have been to Spanish-speaking environments, including Olvera Street, Spanish or Mexican restaurants, parts of Mexico, or have visited Spanish-speaking relatives. A few parents related

how their children translated the menu and ordered for the rest of the family. Similarly, two parents described how helpful their children were at their places of employment. The children would act as interpreters in conversations with the Spanish-speaking personnel.

The parents corroborated the children's report that Spanish was spoken only occasionally in the home. The majority of parents were not of Spanish-speaking background. In only two families was one of the parents a native speaker of Spanish, and in only seven families was there a Spanish-speaking grandparent. While the majority of family members had an educational background in Spanish, they generally rated their ability as only fair. Less than half of the parents (15 out of 34) had plans to visit a Spanish-speaking country. One parent did plan to send his daughter to a Spanish-speaking country for her secondary or college education. While 23 of the parents had Spanish-speaking acquaintances, they tended to speak English with them. Only five parents had taken a Spanish course since their child was enrolled in the Spanish program, and only two were involved with Latin-Americans in community affairs.

7. <u>What were the students' feelings toward the Immersion Program and Did they like receiving all instruction in Spanish</u>?

Out of the 12 students interviewed, only three said that they did not like school. None indicated

particular reasons. Only two children expressed a desire to have a little more English in school. All of the children wanted to continue learning Spanish. Initially, one boy had said he did not want to but when further questioned whether he wanted to stop the following day, he responded, "No, not tomorrow. When I'm in fifth grade, I'll quit. Maybe I'll keep on 'til college." Rather than wanting to switch to a conventional monolingual class, all of the students felt that they were lucky to be in the Spanish class. One boy proudly asserted, "I was the one who chose to be in this class. My Mom and Dad asked me what I wanted, and I said "Spanish!" He further commented, "A group of mothers are trying to kick out the program, and they don't even have one [their own program]!"

The children's enthusiasm for Spanish was supported by the parents' reports. All but one parent indicated that his child enjoyed speaking Spanish and seemed proud of this ability. The one parent did not respond to these two questions. The parents pointed to their children's descriptions of new words, songs, and stories as a measure of their enthusiasm and pride in the program. The parents reported that only seven children had at one time wanted to leave the Immersion Program. Four of them were uncomfortable during the first week of kindergarten, and three had initially felt uncomfortable with the first-grade teacher. Only one first-grade parent reported that her daughter

still had problems understanding the teacher and wanted to leave the program.

The teachers were also questioned as to whether the students enjoyed learning Spanish. The first grade teacher effectively responded,

> That's the beauty of the program. They [the students] can not like reading, they can not like math, or they can not like anything they want. But they can not not like Spanish because it's what they learn in and not what they learn.

The second grade teacher reinforced this remark with, "They are not learning Spanish. They are learning academic courses." The kindergarten teacher contrasted the enthusiasm of the Anglo children in the Immersion Program with the children in the bilingual programs she had previously worked with and observed. In the latter programs, the Anglo children would put their fingers in their ears during Spanish time and say, "Oh, no, it's Spanish time again."

8. Did the students want to learn still another language and What were their reasons for learning a foreign language?

Ten of the 12 students wanted to learn still another foreign language. One wanted to learn French so that she could understand her French friends. Another wanted to learn Chinese so that she could understand her grandmother when she teased her in Chinese. Another,

whose father was Hungarian, planned on learning Hungarian on Saturdays.

When the children were asked, "Why do you think it is good to learn a foreign language?" they responded:

Frequency	Response
5	You can talk to people who don't understand you [in English] and you can understand them.
4	It's fun.
2	If you go there [Mexico], you can speak the language.
1	Cuz it's funnier if you get friends. Then you can speak that language . . . get friends from all over the world.
1	If you have a cousin who only speaks Spanish, you can speak to him.
1	So my sister can't understand me.

The children's reasons were essentially integrative rather than instrumental. They were neither concerned with future job possibilities nor personal status. Instead, they expressed a desire to meet and converse with people from other countries and cultures. The response "so my sister can't understand me" can perhaps best be categorized as a typical comment for a second grader.

The parents were interested in both their children's cultural awareness and economic advancement. When asked why they put their children in the Immersion Program, they responded:

Frequency	Response
26 (77%)	To learn a foreign language.
17 (50%)	(Reasons with cultural emphasis:) It is important to understand another culture. All students should learn that cultural differences are not bad. We want our children to have a broadened outlook, not to be provincial.
15 (44%)	The program is valuable for the children's job opportunities.
10 (26%)	To learn Spanish specifically.
8 (24%)	The Immersion Program offers as intellectual challenge for students who might be bored in regular classrooms.

Just as the primary reason for putting their children into the program was to learn a foreign language, parents regarded the children's rapid progress in Spanish as the program's greatest asset. Parents were particularly aware of the importance of Spanish in Southern California. One commented, "Many Latin Americans live in this area. The Immersion Program and Spanish friends complement each other." Another parent of Mexican background hoped that her son would regain pride in his Spanish heritage.

Summary

The attitudes of the students (Pilot group), teachers, and parents, were highly favorable toward the Immersion Program. All three groups strongly supported the continuation of the program. The children were not only learning but also enjoying Spanish. They were using

their Spanish both inside and outside of school and were anxious to learn yet another language. They appeared happy at school and expressed no major complaints.

Similarly, the parents expressed no major criticism of the program. On the contrary, they were excited about their children's progress in Spanish as well as the stimulating atmosphere of the classes. Specific suggestions for improvement of the program focused on the need for more materials and classroom aides. (Fifteen parents reported having helped in the classroom or with instructional materials.) They also stressed the importance of better understanding of the program in the school and the community. One parent affirmed, "We are proud parents. People should know about the program and set up other ones and exchange ideas."

Rather than being worried about their children falling behind in English, the parents were determined that the major portion of instruction continue to be taught in Spanish. The parent questionnaire contained the following item:

> The Culver City Spanish Immersion Program is similar to a French Immersion Program in Canada. In the Canadian program, slightly more than 50% of the curriculum is taught in English by the seventh grade. Do you think the amount of English in the Spanish Program should also increase? Yes___ No ___ At what rate? Why?

The 11 parents (32%) who felt that the amount of English should be increased stressed the complexity of the

English language and the necessity of learning English-language skills. One parent insisted that once Spanish was firmly established, it needed only to be reinforced for one or two hours daily. On the other hand, 15 parents (44) felt that their children were having no difficulties with English and that it did not need to be increased to 50% of the instruction time. One parent suggested that "at least 60% should be in Spanish because the child gets English outside of class." One mother insisted that the program would fail if more English were introduced.

The teachers agreed that at least 50% of the instruction should continue to be in Spanish. The teachers firmly supported the program and hoped that it would be expanded to other schools. When they were asked about the advantages of an immersion program, the second-grade teacher's immediate response was, "You don't have enough tape on there [for me to include the advantages]." Then she commented, "A child can learn a foreign language with no sweat whatsoever and no suffering. On the contrary, the Spanish flows. It's part of their lives." The kindergarten teacher, Irma Wright, said that in comparison to children in bilingual programs, "Our children are just way ahead. Their Spanish is superior. Just everything is better. In bilingual programs, the kids have trouble answering, '¿Como te llamas?'" The first-grade teacher added, "They [the children in the Immersion Program] can

understand and speak Spanish naturally. Their English skills do not suffer; they score above everyone else on tests. They have positive images of themselves as Americans or as people of Hispanic descent. Things that Irma [the first-grade teacher who is a Chicano] remembers as a child will be things that our kids remember as children too."

All three teachers recognized the cultural significance of the program and felt that Anglo students would be able to cross cultural barriers and improve relations between Americans and Mexican-Americans. The excellent relations between the Anglos and Latin Americans in the class have encouraged greater cultural understanding. As the first-grade teacher puts it, "It gets rid of the old myth that he's dumb because he's Mexican. Students can remember how good Daniel [a Latin-American student] was at reading and Arturo [a Latin-American student] at dancing."

While this chapter has emphasized the positive attitudes of the students, teachers, and parents directly involved with the Immersion Program, its continuation has been a topic of controversy among teachers, parents and administrators not directly involved. Issues that have been raised by non-participating teachers and parents as well as some administrators include: participation of other teachers in making decisions regarding the establishment and continuation of such a program, uneven pupil-teacher classroom ratios created by such an experimental program,

the identification of procedures for selection of students into such a program, the specification of objectives for Spanish-speaking students participating in such a program, and the performance of Anglo participants in English language skills and subject areas such as mathematics. (See Fier, forthcoming for a more detailed description of the controversy.) As Irma Wright pointed out, "Everyone doesn't think we're as great as we think we are."

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Responses to Research Questions

This study presented an evaluation of the Culver City Spanish Immersion Program in its third year. The evaluation focused on a group of first-grade students who began the program in 1972 (Follow-Up group) and a group of second-grade students who were in the original kindergarten class in 1971 (Pilot group). Four major research questions were posed and answered:

1. Are the students suffering a deficit in English oral and language skills?

Though not quite statistically significant, the Follow-Up students in Grade 1 were behind their monolingual peers in English reading skills. This was expected since they had had no formal instruction in English. In French Immersion programs in Canada (Lambert and Tucker, 1972; Barik et al., 1974), initial lags in English reading were also reported at the first-grade level.

At the second-grade level, the Pilot students showed no signs of retardation in English language skills, oral or reading.

2. How are the students progressing in Spanish oral and reading skills?

The Follow-Up group in Grade 1 were reading in Spanish at a level significantly lower than that of native-Spanish-speaking peers in Quito, Ecuador. However, when their scores were compared with those of Mexican-Americans in California, the Follow-Up students were at the 75th percentile in the Vocabulary and Comprehension subtests as well as in the total reading score (Inter-American Test of Reading, Level 1 (R-1-CE).) It should be noted that in their "California Report" (1973), the Guidance Testing Associates warn that the levels presented should be used as illustrations rather than local norms.

At the first-grade level, the difference in scores between the Pilot group and a group of native-Spanish-speaking peers in Guayaquil, Ecuador had been non-significant (Cohen, 1974b). At the second-grade level, a new Comparison group from Quito, Ecuador was used, and the Pilot group scored significantly lower than this group.

However, when the Pilot students were compared to their native-Spanish-speaking classmates in the second-grade Immersion class, their difference in scores was not significant. Moreover, when the Pilot students were compared to native-Spanish-speakers in California taking the Prueba de Lectura, Nivel 1 (L-1-CEs) (Inter-American Series, Guidance Testing Associates), they were at the 90th

percentile in the Level of Comprehension, Speed of Comprehension, and Vocabulary subtests as well as in the total reading score. (It should again be noted that the figures presented in the "California Report" (1973) of the Guidance Testing Associates are to be used as illustrations rather than local norms.)

In conclusion, neither the Follow-Up students in Grade 1 nor the Pilot students in Grade 2 were reading at the same level as their native-Spanish-speaking peers in Quito, Ecuador. However, their reading proficiency compared quite satisfactorily with native-Spanish-speaking students in California.

3. Are the students achieving at grade level in a non-language subject matter, i.e., mathematics?

At the first-grade level, both the Pilot (Broadbent, 1973) and the Follow-Up group scored at grade level. In Grade 2, the Pilot students scored higher than their English Comparison group.

4. What are the attitudes of participating students, teachers, and parents toward the Spanish Immersion Program?

The students have developed positive attitudes toward the Spanish language and culture and toward foreign language learning in general. Both the Immersion teachers and parents strongly supported the program and advocated

its continuation.

Limitations of this Study

In the search for answers to the four research questions in this study, various problems were encountered in the collection of both attitudinal and test data. Though repeated attempts were made to secure responses to the parent questionnaires, only 52% of the parents returned the forms. Perhaps the length of the questionnaires discouraged parents from completing them; several parents apologized to me for not having returned the forms. The responses of the 52% were overwhelmingly in favor of the Immersion Program. Throughout the year, I had contact with the parents and had observed their enthusiasm for the program. Consequently, I had no reason to believe that the remainder of the parents would express disapproval of the program.

Unfortunately, difficulties arose in the administration of the Bilingual Syntax Measure in Quito, Ecuador. First and second-graders were tested in early March, but the test results could not be used in this study because the test instructions were misinterpreted (even though they were written in Spanish). Rather than having the examiner record each student's oral responses, the children were directed to write down their own responses. Thus, the test was transformed from one of oral skills into one of

written skills.

In the administration of the various tests to the students at the Linwood Howe Elementary School, problems also developed. The children were between five and eight years old and some had trouble concentrating for the duration of the test. Others were particularly disruptive. Certainly, some students are better test takers than others.

There were the additional problems of tester effect and testing location. I was familiar to the Immersion students but not to the students from the monolingual classrooms. The testing done in the smaller rooms, such as the school library and the classroom, was more effective than the total group testing situations in the school cafeteria. In spite of these difficulties, the testing periods were neither unduly tense nor uncomfortable.

Not only external factors, but also the validity and reliability of the test instruments must be considered. In their respective manuals, the reliability and validity of the reading and mathematical tests are outlined. Upon administration of these tests, however, certain items appeared to be ineffective. In analyzing the items on the Bilingual Syntax Measure, I felt that certain test items were badly worded, and certain grammatical structures were beyond the student's linguistic capacity. However, the test was only in its pilot form, and items will surely be changed in the final version. The Bilingual Syntax

Measure did effectively elicit samples of natural speech which provided relevant information about the children's oral proficiency.

Conclusions

The results of this study indicate the effectiveness of an immersion program both in the learning of a second language and the development of positive attitudes toward another ethnic group. The Anglo students in the Spanish Immersion Program are suffering no retardation in their native-language or mathematical skills, are satisfactorily advancing in Spanish, and are developing an appreciation of Hispanic culture. Relationships between the Anglo- and Latin-Americans in the Immersion classes have been outstanding.

The results of the Spanish Immersion Program contrast with those often obtained in foreign-language classes and in bilingual programs. When foreign-language instruction is limited to either daily or weekly periods, rarely do students develop native-like skills (Macnamara, 1973). The instruction is often limited to structured drills rather than communicative acts. Little sensitivity toward the foreign culture is awakened. Unfortunately, many of the Anglo students in the bilingual programs funded under Title VII are also neither developing proficiency in a foreign language nor an appreciation of another

culture. The contact between the Anglo- and Latin-Americans in these programs is often minimal both inside and outside of class (Cohen, 1974b).

While the success of an immersion program when applied to Anglo students is apparent, findings may not be relevant for other groups of students. The non-native-English-speaking child often enters school lacking a knowledge of the prestige language (English in the United States), support from parents, or encouragement from teachers. In many cases, before entering school, he has neither developed proficiency in his native language nor in English. In school, the non-native English-speaking student then has to compete with native-English-speaking peers. (The Spanish Immersion children all started as monolinguals in kindergarten and were not frustrated by the superior linguistic capacity of their Spanish-speaking peers, who joined the group only in Grade 1.) Before the establishment of bilingual programs, the non-native student was "immersed" in the language and culture of the majority. He was expected to learn their language while no attention was paid to his native language or culture. Rarely were qualified teachers available who understood his linguistic difficulties. Consequently, the child continually experienced failure and frustration in his academic environment. For the Anglo child in the Spanish Immersion Program, the learning of Spanish is an exciting

intellectual challenge which is undertaken voluntarily; for the non-native, the learning of English is too often a necessity imposed by society.

In conclusion, immersion programs can be highly successful when the characteristics of the students, parents, and teachers for whom the program is designed are carefully considered. Given the appropriate variables, the immersion format offers a valuable, innovative experiment in education which should be continued and expanded.

Recommendations

This study has revealed the effectiveness of an immersion program while recognizing the importance of the variables involved. The studies that have been undertaken at Culver City (Cathcart, 1972; Broadbent, 1973; Flores, 1973; Cohen, 1974b), as well as the present study, emphasize the value of the Spanish Immersion Program. Nevertheless, further research is essential. Not only should answers to the questions posed in this study be obtained yearly to determine the long-range effects of the Immersion Program, but new research questions, such as the following, should be explored:

1. What is the effect of the Spanish Immersion Program on the native Spanish-speaking children involved? Are these students progressing satisfactorily in their academic subjects? What are their attitudes and those of

their parents toward the Immersion Program? A comparison could be made of the native-Spanish-speaking students in the Spanish Immersion Program, in a monolingual English program, and in a bilingual program to ascertain academic and attitudinal differences.

2. What are the attitudes of the students, teachers, and parents of children in the same school but not directly involved in the Spanish Immersion Program? In Chapter III difficulties with the school administration and non-participating parents and teachers were pointed out. A careful examination of these problems could be undertaken to identify the causes.

3. What is the Anglo student's pattern of second-language acquisition in the Immersion Program? Are the errors made by Anglos similar to those of native-Spanish-speaking classmates in the same program? (See Boyd, forthcoming.)

4. If monolingual speakers of English are placed in the Spanish Immersion Program after the kindergarten year, can they progress satisfactorily in English language skills and other academic areas as well as develop proficiency in Spanish? (In the spring of 1974, two monolingual English speakers were placed into the Immersion classes: a girl in Grade 2 and her brother in Grade 1.)

In conclusion, I feel that the Culver City Spanish Immersion Program is a valuable experiment in U. S. education that offers a stimulating experience for students as well as a dynamic area for research. Numerous immersion programs have been established and well-received in Canada; hopefully, more immersion programs will be established and supported in the United States.

REFERENCES

Andersson, Theodore and Mildred Boyer. Bilingual Schooling in the United States. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

Armor, David O. and Arthur S. Couch. Data-text primer. New York: The Free Press, 1972.

Barik, H., M. Swain, and K. McTavish. Immersion classes in an English setting: One way for Les Anglais to learn French. Working Papers on Bilingualism. 2:38-53, Bilingual Education Project, Ontario, Canada, 1974.

Boyd, Patricia. "The acquisition of Spanish as a second language by Anglo children in the third year of an immersion program." M.A. Thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, forthcoming.

Broadbent, Robert R. "Some consequences of following an elementary school curriculum in a second language." M.A. Thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, 1973.

Bruck, M., W. E. Lambert, and G. R. Tucker. "Cognitive and attitudinal consequences of bilingual schooling: The St. Lambert project through grade six." Unpublished manuscript, McGill University, Montreal, Canada, 1973.

Bruck, M., W. E. Lambert, and R. Tucker. "Bilingual schooling through the elementary grades: The St. Lambert project at grade seven." Unpublished manuscript, McGill University, Montreal, Canada, 1974.

Burt M., H. Dulay, and E. Hernández Ch. Bilingual syntax measure, restricted version. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1973.

Campbell, Russell N. "Bilingual education in Culver City." Workpapers in Teaching English as a Second Language. 6:87-92, University of California, Los Angeles, 1972.

Cathcart, Ruth L. "Report on a group of Anglo children after one year of immersion in instruction in Spanish." M.A. Thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, 1972.

Cohen, Andrew D. "Bilingual/bicultural education revisited: A ' inority' viewpoint." Paper presented at the Annual International Conference on Bilingual-Bicultural Education. New York: May 15-18, 1974a.

Cohen, Andrew D. The Culver City Spanish immersion project: The first two years. The Modern Language Journal. 58:95-103, 1974b.

Cohen, Andrew D. "The effects of several years of bilingual schooling on language maintenance: What language is Juanito using now?" Paper presented at the California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages Conference, San Francisco, April 26-28, 1974c.

Cohen, A., V. Fier, and M. Flores. "The Culver City immersion program--end of year #1 and year #2." Workpapers in Teaching English as a Second Language. 7:65-74, University of California, Los Angeles, 1973.

Davis, Frederick B. Philippine language-teaching experiments. Quezon City, Philippines: Alemar-Phoenix, 1967.

Fier, Violet. "The Culver City Spanish immersion program: An overview." M. A. Thesis, Occidental College, California, forthcoming.

Flores, Marco A. "An early stage in the acquisition of Spanish morphology by a group of English-speaking children." M.A. Thesis, University of California, Los Angeles, 1973.

Goodman, Paul. Growing up absurd: Problems of youth in the organized system. New York: Random House, 1960.

Gudschinsky, Sarah C. "Literacy in the mother tongue and second language learning." Conference on Child Language, Chicago, Nov. 22-24, 1971. Conference Reprints, pp. 241-355. Laval, Quebec: Les Presses de l'Universite, 1971.

Guidance Testing Associates. Supplement to 1967 manual of Inter-American tests: California report. Austin, Texas: Guidance Testing Associates, 1973.

Holt, John. How children fail. New York: Pitman, 1964.

Jakobovits, Leon A. Foreign language learning: A psycholinguistic analysis of the issues. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House, 1970.

John, Vera P. and Vivian M. Horner. Early childhood bilingual education. New York: The Modern Language Association, 1971.

Lambert, W. E. and R. C. Gardner. Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning. Mass: Newbury House, 1972.

Lambert, W. E. and G. R. Tucker. Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House Publishers, Inc., 1972.

Lambert, W. E., G. R. Tucker, and A. d'Angelan. "An innovative approach to second-language learning: The St. Lambert experiment." Unpublished Manuscript, McGill University, Montreal, Canada, 1972.

Macnamara, Joh. Bilingualism in primary education. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1966.

Macnamara, John. The effects of instruction in a weaker language. Journal of Social Issues. 23:121-135, 1967.

Macnamara, John. The cognitive strategies of language learning. Focus on the Learner: Pragmatic Strategies for the Language Teacher. Edited by Oller, J. and J. Richards. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House, 1973.

Modiano, Nancy. National or mother language in beginning reading: A comparative study. Research in the Teaching of English. 1:32-43, 1968.

Nie, Norman H. and C. H. Hadlai. Statistical package for the social sciences: Update manual. National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, 1972.

Postman, Neil and Charles Weingartner. Teaching English as a subversive activity. New York: A Delta Book, 1969.

Saville, Muriel R. and Rudolph C. Troike. A handbook of bilingual education. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 1971.

The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education. Monographs on Fundamental Education, VIII. Paris: UNESCO, 1953.

Thonis, Eleanor. Teaching reading to non-native English speakers. New York: Macmillan Company, 1970.

Valencia, Atilano. Bilingual-bicultural education for Spanish-English bilnnguals. Las Vegas, New Mexico: New Mexico Highlands University Press, 1972.

Wright, Lawrence. The bilingual education movement at the crossroads. Phi Delta Kappan 55:183-187, 1973.

APPENDIX I

STUDENT INTERVIEW FORM

I. SPEAKING

1. Can you say things more easily in Spanish or English? Why?

2. Do you like to speak Spanish or English better?

3. Do you ever have trouble speaking in Spanish? What kind of trouble?

4. Do you ever think in Spanish?

5. Do you count in Spanish or English?

6. Have you ever dreamed in Spanish?

II. UNDERSTANDING

1. Do you ever have trouble understanding your teacher? When?

2. Do you ever have trouble understanding Arturo, Daniel, etc. (the native Spanish speakers in the class)?

III. READING

1. Can you read more easily in Spanish or English? Why?

2. Do you like to read Spanish or English better? Why?

IV. WRITING

1. Can you write more easily in Spanish or English? Why?

2. Do you like to write Spanish or English better? Why?

V. USE OF SPANISH OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM

1. Do you ever watch Spanish T.V. programs? How often? Are they difficult to understand?

2. Do you ever listen to Spanish radio programs? How often? Are they difficult to understand?

3. Do you have any Spanish records at home? Do you listen to them? How often?

4. Do you have any Spanish books at home? Do you read them? How often?

5. Have you ever been to a Mexican or Spanish restaurant? Did you speak Spanish there?

6. Do you have any friends who speak Spanish and are not in your class? Do you speak English or Spanish with them? Why?

7. Would you like to have more friends who speak Spanish? Why?

8. Do you ever speak Spanish at home? When? How often?

9. Have you taught anyone in your family any Spanish? What?

10. Have you ever helped someone who could not understand English? Who? When? Where?

VI. USE OF SPANISH IN THE CLASSROOM

1. Do you always speak Spanish in class? Do you sometimes speak English? When? Why? Are there certain things you say in Spanish or in English?

2. Do you ever speak Spanish during English hour, recess, or lunch period?

VII. ATTITUDES ABOUT SCHOOL

1. Do you like school?

2. Do you like having everything taught to you in Spanish? Would you like more English? Would you rather be in a different class?

3. Were you frightened in kindergarten when you heard only Spanish?

4. Do you want to keep on learning Spanish?

5. Do you want to learn still another language? What?

6. Why do you think it's good to learn a foreign language?

7. Do you think you're lucky to be in this class?

APPENDIX II

TEACHER INTERVIEW FORM

I. COMPREHENSION

1. What are some of the initial reactions of the children when they realize that you will only speak Spanish to them (anger, fear, disbelief, etc.)?

2. Have any of the children asked you why they are in a special program, or why you always speak Spanish to them? What do you answer?

3. Do you pretend not to understand the children's English or do you react to it? Why?

4. When, in general, do the children begin to understand what you are saying?

5. Are there certain types of students that are particularly quick at understanding? Why do you think so?

6. Are there any students who have particular problems understanding you? What do you think is the cause (language difficulties, inability to concentrate, slow learners, etc.)

7. Do you think that most of the children understand the majority of what you are saying?

II. SPEAKING / SPANISH

1. When do students, in general, first begin responding in Spanish? in words? in phrases? in sentences?

2. At what level do they begin using difficult grammatical structures? past tense? subject/verb agreement? etc.?

3. What kinds of mistakes do they make speaking? (pronunciation, grammar)

4. Do you correct their pronunciation errors? How? When? Why?

5. Do you correct their grammar errors? How? When? Why?

6. Are the mistakes of the Anglo children similar to those of the native-Spanish speakers? If so, please describe.

7. Do you think the children enjoy speaking Spanish, or do they regard it as a burden?

8. Are certain students more verbal than others? Are they verbal both in Spanish and in English? Do they learn Spanish more quickly than less verbal children? Are they in general better students?

9. Do some students have particular problems speaking Spanish? What are the causes (shyness, lack of comprehension, lack of vocabulary, etc.)? Do these students have similar problems in English?

10. In the classroom, What percentage of verbalization goes on in Spanish?

teacher to student
student to teacher
Anglo to Anglo
Latin to Latin (native-Spanish speakers)
Anglo to Latin
Latin to Anglo

11. Is there English interference in spoken Spanish? Please give examples.

12. Is there Spanish interference in spoken English? Please give examples.

III. READING / SPANISH

1. What method do you use to teach Spanish reading?

2. Do you correct the students' pronunciation when they are reading?

3. Do you correct their grammar when they are reading?

4. What kinds of problems do they have (vocabulary, speed, comprehension, etc.)?

IV. READING / ENGLISH

1. What method do you use to teach English reading?

2. Do you correct the students' pronunciation?

3. Do you correct the student's grammar?

4. Are their problems similar to those they have in reading Spanish?

V. READING / GENERAL

1. Do students, in general, read at the same level in Spanish and in English? If exceptions, please describe.

2. Do you recognize any English interference in Spanish reading?

3. Do you recognize any Spanish interference in English reading?

4. When do you think instruction in English reading should be begun? Why?

5. Do you think the students prefer reading in Spanish or English?

VI. WRITING / SPANISH

1. What types of Spanish writing activities do the students perform? (creative writing, book reports, grammar exercises, etc.)

2. How often do the students write in Spanish?

3. Do you correct their written errors? How? Do they have to re-write exercises?

4. What kinds of errors do the students make?
   mechanical: spelling, punctuation
   grammatical: inflections, agreement, sentence structure
   vocabulary

5. Are the errors of the Anglos similar to those of the Latins? Please give examples.

VII. WRITING / ENGLISH

1. What types of English writing activities do the students perform?

2. How often do the students write in English?

3. Do you correct their written errors? How?

4. What kinds of errors do the students make? Are the errors similar to those made in Spanish?

VIII. READING / GENERAL

1. Do you feel that the students write better in Spanish or English in regard to mechanics, grammar, vocabulary, creativity?

2. Do you think the students prefer writing in Spanish or English?

3. Do you recognize any English interference in Spanish writing?

4. Do you recognize any Spanish interference in English writing?

IX. SPECIAL STUDENTS

1. Are any students having particular problems in math? Does having math instruction in Spanish cause any problems?

2. Are there any mentally-gifted chidlren in the class? Is the program particularly beneficial for them?

3. Are the relationships between the Anglos and the Latins good? Are they good friends? Do they help each other with their work? with language problems? Do the native-Spanish speakers usually stay together? Do you think the inclusion of native-Spanish speakers is important? Why? How many should there be? Should there be native-Spanish speakers at the kindergarten level too?

X. CURRICULUM

1. Please write down an approximate schedule of your daily activities.

2. Do the three teachers plan the curriculum together or individually?

3. Which activity do you feel you present most effectively?

4. Which activity arouses the greatest student interest?

5. In which activity is the learning of Spanish most effective?

6. Do you present Hispanic cultural material? What kinds? How often? Does this material promote student interest?

7. Were any of the Anglo students in a Spanish-speaking country before they began the program? Have any been to one since?

8. Do you present cultural material about the United States? What kinds? How often? Is student interest aroused?

XI. MATERIALS

1. Are your teaching materials adequate? If not, what is lacking?

2. What kinds of materials do you use? Have you designed most of your material? If so, please decribe.

3. Do you translate all material into Spanish, or is some of it still in English?

4. Do you think special materials should be designed for an immersion program? Please give examples.

XII. TEACHING METHOD

1. What is your general method of teaching? Please describe how you present new material and how the students work (in groups or individually).

2. Which activities are generally done in groups? individually?

3. Do you think that the present open-space classroom with the kindergarten, first, and second grades interacting is effective or ineffective? Why?

4. What is the present classroom situation? How often are the classes mixed? How many students is a teacher usually responsible for?

XIII. PERSONAL BACKGROUND

1. Are you of Hispanic descent? Please describe.

2. Do you ever speak Spanish outside of class? Do you have contact with Spanish speakers outside of school?

3. Do you speak Spanish or English with the other Immersion teachers?

4. How did you learn of the Immersion Program?

5. Briefly describe your teaching experience (grades taught, number of years, where, etc.).

XIV. GENERAL ATTITUDES

1. What do you think are the advantages of an immersion program?

2. What are the disadvantages of an immersion program?

3. What are the main problems with the Culver City Spanish Immersion Program?

4. Do you think this program should be continued?

5. Up to what grade level should the major part of instruction be in Spanish? Why?

6. What do you envision as the future of the program? Will it continue? Will it be enlarged? Will similar programs be developed in other communities?

7. What do you envision as the future of the Anglo students in the program? Will they improve relations between Anglo-Americans and Mexican-Americans? Will they become fluent bilinguals? by what grade level? If they were put into a regular English classroom now, would they forget their Spanish? Would they maintain an interest in Spanish?

8. How much support or criticism have you received (from school administrators, teachers, and parents)?

9. Do you think an immersion program is suitable for all children? for only certain personality types? harmful for others?

10. What qualifications do you think are essential for a teacher in an immersion rrogram?

APPENDIX III

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Your name:
   Relationship to child:
   CHILD'S name:
   age:
   class:
   Number of children:
   name age

   Please mark an X beside those children enrolled in the Spanish Immersion Program. Please fill out a separate form for each child enrolled in the Immersion Program.

2. FATHER'S name:
   birthplace:
   educational background: (Please mark an X beside the highest level completed.)
   ___primary school (Grades 1-8)
   ___secondary school (Grades 8-12)
   ___vocational school (secretarial, mechanics, etc.)
   ___two-year college
   ___four-year college
   ___graduate school
   occupation:
   Are you currently employed? ___Yes ___No
   present job:

3. MOTHER's name:
   birthplace:
   educational background:
   ___primary school (Grades 1-8)
   ___secondary school (Grades 9-12)
   ___vocational school (secretarial, mechanics, etc.)
   ___two-year college
   ___four-year college
   ___graduate school
   occupation:
   Are you currently employed? ___Yes ___No
   present job:

4. FATHER'S family background (nationality or nationalities):
   Are FATHER'S parents native speakers of English? ___Yes ___No
   If not, what is their native language?
   FATHER'S native language:

5. MOTHER'S family background (nationality or nationalities):
   Are MOTHER'S parents native speakers of English? ___Yes___No
   If not, what is their native language?
   FATHER'S native language:

6. Have any members of your family (other than the children in the Immersion Program) learned Spanish? ___Yes ___No
   Please rate ability: excellent, good, fair, poor.

Family Member	Ability	Where Learned	Number of Years

7. Have any members of your family learned a foreign language other than Spanish? ___Yes ___No
   Please rate ability: excellent, good, fair, poor.

Family Member	Ability	Where Learned	Number of Years

8. Has any member of your family spent any time in a foreign country?
   ___Yes ___NO If so, please describe:

Family Member	Country	Period of Stay	Purpose of Stay

9. Do you have any plans to take a trip to a Spanish-speaking country?
   ___Yes ___No If so, please describe.

10. Do you have any Spanish-speaking acquaintances? ___Yes ___No
    About how many?
    Do you speak Spanish with them? ___often ___sometimes ___rarely

11. Have you taken any Spanish courses since your child entered the Immersion Program? ___Yes ___No
    If so, please describe (Where? For how long?).

12. Are you involved in any community activities with Latin-Americans (other than the Immersion Program)?
    If so, please describe.

13. Have you purchased any Spanish reading materials for your child's use at home? ___Yes ___No Please describe the materials.

Does your child use them? ___Yes ___No

14. Do you have a Spanish-English dictionary at home? ___Yes ___No
Does your child use it? ___Yes ___No

15. Do you ever speak Spanish in your family? ___Yes ___No
If so, please describe.

16. Do you ever read to your child in Spanish? ___never ___rarely
___sometimes ___often

17. Do you ever help your child with his homework? ___Yes ___No
With which subjects?
Does he have any particular problems?
Are you able to help him with any problems in Spanish? ___Yes
___No

18. Does your child have any chance to speak Spanish outside of school?
___Yes ___No
With whom?
___other members of the family
___relatives
___his friends
___other (Please explain.)

19. Does your child have any Spanish-speaking friends (other than those in the Immersion Program)? ___Yes ___No If so, how many?
Does he speak Spanish with them? ___never ___rarely ___sometimes
___often

20. Does your child ever listen to Spanish radio? ___Yes ___No
___never ___rarely ___sometimes ___often

21. Does your child ever watch Spanish T.V. programs? ___Yes ___No
___never ___rarely ___sometimes ___often

22. Does he ever go to Spanish movies? ___Yes ___No
___never ___rarely ___sometimes ___often

23. Do you have any Spanish records? ___Yes ___No About how many?
Does your child listen to them? ___Yes ___No
___never ___rarely ___sometimes ___often

24. Have one or both of the parents taken the child to Spanish-speaking environments (e.g. Olvera Street, Spanish-speaking restaurants, Mexico, Spanish-speaking relatives, etc.)?
___Yes ___No
If yes, please specify the situations:

25. Did your child learn how to read in English at home? ___Yes ___No
Please describe the material he reads and how often.

26. Do you read to your child in English? ___Yes ___No
___never ___rarely ___sometimes ___often

27. How do you think your child feels about going to school? (happy, unhappy, does not care, etc.) Why? What does he like the most at school? the least?

28. Do you think your child enjoys speaking Spanish? ___Yes ___No
Does he seem proud of his Spanish ability? ___Yes ___No
Does he ever talk about new words, stories, or songs which he has learned in school? ___Yes ___No
Does he ever mention things he has learned about Latin America or Spain? ___Yes ___No

If possible, please provide details.

29. Does your child ever speak Spanish in front of you? ___Yes ___No
___never ___rarely ___sometimes ___often

30. Does he ever complain about receiving all instruction in Spanish?
___Yes ___No
___never ___rarely ___sometimes ___often

31. Has he ever asked to leave the Immersion Program? ___Yes ___No
If yes, please explain.

32. Do you think your child is having any problems understanding, speaking, reading, or writing English? ___Yes ___No
If yes, please explain.

33. Do you think your child is falling behind in non-language subject matter, e.g. math? ___Yes ___No
If so, please explain.

34. How did you hear of the Spanish Immersion Program?

35. What were your reasons for putting your child in the program? (to learn a foreign language, to learn about Mexican-American culture, to have better job possibilities, etc.)
Please * what you feel is the most important reason.
1.
2.
3.
4.

36. What do you like about the Immersion Program? (atmosphere, child's advancement in Spanish, etc.) Please * the most important quality.
1.
2.
3.
4.

37. How could the program be improved? (materials, organization, etc.)
1.
2.
3.
4.

38. Do you think the program should be continued? ___Yes ___No

39. Have many people asked you about the program? ___Yes ___No
Do they react favorably toward the program? ___Yes ___No
Please describe their reactions.

40. Do you have any younger children whom you plan on enrolling in the Immersion Program? ___Yes ___No How many?

41. Have you heard of attempts to set up similar programs? ___Yes ___No
If so, where? Please describe.

42. The Culver City Spanish Immersion Program is similar to a French Immersion Program in Canada. In the Canadian program, slightly more than 50% of the curriculum is taught in English by the seventh grade. Do you think the amount of English in the Spanish Program should also increase? ___Yes ___No At what rate? Why?

43. Have you ever helped with the Immersion Program, either inside or outside the classroom? ___Yes ___No
If so, please describe.

44. What kinds of school functions do you attend?
Type of Function (e.g. P.T.A.) How Often?

45. Please include any anecdote about your child's speaking Spanish outside of the classroom.

46. If you have any additonal comments, please include them here.